

1 Robert L. Sallander, Esq., (SBN 118352)  
2 rsallander@gpsllp.com  
3 Helen H. Chen, Esq., (SBN 213150)  
4 hchen@gpsllp.com  
5 GREENAN, PEFFER, SALLANDER & LALLY LLP  
6 2000 Crow Canyon Place, Suite 380  
7 San Ramon, California 94583  
8 Telephone: (925) 866-1000  
9 Facsimile: (925) 830-8787

10  
11 Attorneys for Defendant(s)  
12 THOMSON INTERNATIONAL, INC.

13  
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
15 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16 MATTHEW PETERSON, SADIE FLODING,  
17 COLIN STRUB, CARSON BRENDA, JODY  
18 BARRY, TEISCHA BENSON, LYNNETTA  
19 KLAM, and LORI DAVIES,

20 Plaintiff(s),  
21 v.  
22

23 THOMSON INTERNATIONAL,  
24 INCORPORATED, a California corporation;  
25 DOES 1-10, INCLUSIVE; and ROE  
26 ENTITIES 1-10, INCLUSIVE,

27 Defendant(s).

28 Case No.: 1:22-cv-00701 JLT-CDB

**DEFENDANT THOMSON  
INTERNATIONAL, INC.'S  
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION TO AMEND RULE 16  
SCHEDULING ORDER**

Date: May 31, 2023  
Time: 10:30 a.m.  
Place: 510 19<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 200  
Bakersfield, CA

Magistrate Judge: Hon. Christopher D. Baker

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4), defendant Thomson International, Inc. ("Thomson") respectfully requests the court to amend Rule 16 scheduling order.

I. **Thomson Was Diligent in Assisting the Court in Creating a Workable Rule 16 Order**

Rule 16(b)(4) of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure states:

(4) Modifying a Schedule. A schedule may be modified only for good cause and with judge's consent.

1 Fed. R. Civ. Pro. Rule 16(b)(4) is referring to any modification of a Rule 16 Scheduling  
2 Order issued by the Court.

3 The Ninth Circuit defined “good cause” in *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreation*, 925 F. 2d  
4 604, 610 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992)(internal citations omitted):

5 Rule 16(b)’s “good cause” standard primarily considers the  
6 diligence of the party seeking the amendment. The district court  
7 may modify the pretrial schedule “if it cannot reasonably be met  
despite the diligence of the party seeking the extension.” Fed. R.  
8 Civ. P. 16 advisory committee’s notes (1983 amendment) . . .  
9 [T]he focus of the inquiry is upon the moving party’s reasons for  
seeking modification.

10 The Eastern District construed the diligence requirement in *Jackson v. Laureate, Inc.*, 186  
11 F.R.D. 605, 608 (E.D. Cal. 1999)(internal citations omitted):

12 to demonstrate diligence under Rule 16’s “good cause” standard,  
13 the movant may be required to show the following: (1) that she  
was diligent in assisting the Court in creating a workable rule 16  
14 order; (2) that her noncompliance with a Rule 16 deadline occurred  
or will occur, notwithstanding her diligent efforts to comply,  
15 because of the development of matters which could not have been  
reasonably foreseen or anticipated at the time of the Rule 16  
16 scheduling conference; and (3) that she was diligent in seeking  
amendment of the Rule 16 order, once it became apparent that she  
17 could not comply with the order.

18  
19 In the case at bar, eight plaintiffs from two countries and five states filed this action  
20 against Thomson. None of the plaintiffs reside in California. On August 4, 2022, Thomson  
21 assisted the Court in creating a workable Rule 16 order by filing a Joint Scheduling Order. (Dkt.  
22 9.) On August 18, 2022, the Court adopted the proposed schedule and issued a Scheduling Order  
23 in this case. (Dkt. 19.) Non-expert discovery deadline is May 18, 2023. (*Id.*) Thomson  
24 diligently attempted to adhere to the schedule throughout the subsequent course of the litigation.

25 **II. Thomson Was Diligent in Complying with the Scheduling Order**

26 On September 15, 2022, Thomson served the following discovery requests upon all eight  
27 plaintiffs: (1) Interrogatories, Set One; and (2) Request for Production of Documents, Set One.  
28 (Sallander Decl., ¶ 4.) Starting November 10, 2022, Thomson has sent out authorizations to

1 plaintiffs to release their records from their medical providers, Food & Drug  
2 Administration (“FDA”), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (“CDC”), and state and  
3 county public health agencies, and has sent out all records requests after receipt of  
4 authorizations. (Sallander Decl., ¶ 5.) However, despite Thomson’s diligence, 33 records are  
5 still outstanding. (Sallander Decl., ¶ 6.)

6 **III. Thomson Was Diligent in Seeking Amendment of the Rule 16 Order**

7 On April 19, 2023, defense counsel met & conferred with plaintiff counsel concerning  
8 extending deadlines. (Sallander Decl., ¶ 7.) Plaintiff counsel refused to extend the trial date.  
9 (*Id.*) On April 24, 2023, defense firm contacted the court concerning scheduling a hearing for  
10 motion to amend schedule. (Sallander Decl., ¶ 8.)

11 **IV. It Will Be Unduly Prejudicial to Thomson If the Deadlines Are Not Extended**

12 With 33 records still outstanding, Thomson will not be able to complete discovery before  
13 the May 18, 2023 non-expert discovery deadline. While Thomson noticed plaintiffs’ depositions  
14 to preserve rights, it is impossible to take meaningful depositions without complete records.  
15 (Sallander Decl., ¶ 9.)

16 Moreover, expert disclosure deadline is June 1, 2023. Thomson’s experts will not be able  
17 to fully evaluate plaintiffs’ claims without the outstanding records.

18 Finally, Thomson will be unduly prejudiced in motion practices and cannot adequately  
19 prepare for trial without complete records.

20 Therefore, it will be extremely detrimental to Thomson if the deadlines are not extended.

21 **V. Thomson Requests a Nine Months Non-Expert Discovery Extension**

22 Thomson anticipates that a nine months non-expert discovery extension is necessary to  
23 complete factual discovery based on the experiences of consolidated Thomson cases in the  
24 Eastern District.

25 The Court has granted ninth months extensions for consolidated Thomson cases.<sup>1</sup>  
26 Discovery is more extensive in this case than the consolidated cases. This case has eight

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> *Angelo v. Thomson*, case no. 1:21-cv-01609-JLT-CDB, Dkt. 40; *Annonette Sartori v.*  
*Thomson*, case no. 1:22-cv-00027-JLT-CDB, Dkt. 31; *Paquette v. Thomson*, case no. 1:22-cv-

1 plaintiffs. Before consolidation, five individual cases have only one plaintiff, one individual case  
2 has three plaintiffs, and one individual case has six plaintiffs. (*Angelo v. Thomson*, case no.  
3 1:21-cv-01609-JLT-CDB, Dkt. 40 at 4:8, 4:17, 5:2, 5:11, 5:20, 5:27, 6:6.)

4 There are no discovery delays or disputes in the consolidated cases. By contrast, the  
5 parties have appeared before the Court twice on discovery disputes (Dkt. 36, 43), and Thomson  
6 will file a motion to compel further responses to Interrogatory No. 17 as repeated meet & confer  
7 efforts have failed. Based on past experiences in this case, discovery issues may potentially arise  
8 in depositions of plaintiffs.

9 Accordingly, a nine months extension of factual discovery deadline is necessary for  
10 Thomson to complete discovery.

11 **VI. Conclusion**

12 Based upon the foregoing, good cause has been shown and Thomson respectfully  
13 requests that the Rule 16 Scheduling Order in this case be modified and the deadlines be  
14 continued to allow Thomson to properly prepare for trial and conduct discovery.

15 Respectfully submitted,

16 Dated: April 26, 2023

17 GREENAN, PEFFER, SALLANDER  
& LALLY, LLP

18  
19 By: /s/  
20 Robert L. Sallander, Esq.  
Helen H. Chen, Esq.  
21 Attorneys for Defendant(s)  
THOMSON INTERNATIONAL, INC.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

---

00034-JLT-CDB, Dkt. 31; *Garofalo v. Thomson*, case no. 1:22-cv-00037-JLT-CDB, Dkt. 27;  
*Jackson v. Thomson*, case no. 1:22-cv-00038-JLT-CDB, Dkt. 31; *Sams v. Thomson*, Case no.  
1:22-cv-00387-JLT-CDB, Dkt. 28; *Austin v. Thomson*, case no. 1:22-cv-00388-JLT-CDB, Dkt.  
25.